UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,114	02/02/2006	Dietmar Spanke	SPAN3007/FJD	9464

23364   7590   03/17/2010
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176

EXAMINER
FRANK, RODNEY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2856	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 February 2010_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _8-18_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _8-17_ is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) _18_ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _2/6/06, to include changes filed 3/16/09_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over

Jackson ET al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0093519; hereinafter

referred to as Jackson). Jackson discloses a tank side monitor includes two processor

boards, a main/communication board, containing field communications interface

circuitry and interface circuitry, and an optional IS module, containing HART interface

circuitry. The two processor boards are link by an optically coupled serial

communications bus. The HART circuitry is multiplexed and can be operated by either

the Main/Communication board processor or a local processor on the HART IS board.

The optional IS module, an extension of the HART IS board, provides options such as

an IS 4-20 mA input or output or other IS I/O. The TSM employs a modular approach for

hardware and software, whose implementation consists of a number of modules and

programs, the first being the Main/Communications board software. Other programs

are contained within the HART interface module. Due to the modular approach taken in

the hardware design, the software is also modular and operates on two hardware

modules: Main/Communications module software; and HART module software (Please see the abstract).

With respect to claim 8, Jackson discloses a fill-level measuring device for measuring a fill-level of a fill substance in a container, comprising a measuring unit (see paragraph [0025]), which serves to produce a measurement signal dependent on the fill level in the container; a memory (see for example paragraph [0035]), in which parameter sets for different applications are stored (see, for example, paragraph [0057]); and an evaluating unit (see paragraph [0018]), which serves to select a parameter set, and on the basis of the selected parameter set, to derive the fill level from the measurement signal, and to make the derived fill level available for further processing, evaluation and/or display (see paragraph [0057]). While the reference does not explicitly disclose that the memory contains that the parameter set/instructions for the device to operate are stored for every possible application in which the fill level measuring device is to be used, the Jackson reference disclose the use of a memory to store instructions for the devices operation. While it is not explicitly stated that every possible instruction is stored, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store the parameter sets and instructions necessary for the device to function as intended. The device is disclosed to operate based upon a users input in order to perform specific tests. Therefore, it would be obvious to have a full set of all possible parameters for the user to select from, instead of only a partial set of parameters.

With respect to claim 9, the fill-level measuring device as claimed in claim 8, in combination with an on-site interface, via which an operator can input, which parameter set is to be selected is disclosed in claim 12 of the reference.

With respect to claim 10, the fill-level measuring device as claimed in claim 8, in combination with a communication interface, via which can be input, which parameter set is to be selected is disclosed in claim 12 of the reference.

With respect to claim 11, Jackson discloses a method for fill-level measurement using a fill-level measuring device comprising: a measuring unit which serves to produce a measurement signal dependent on the fill level in the container; a memory in which parameter sets for different applications are stored; and an evaluation unit which serves to select a parameter set, and on the basis of the selected parameter set, to derive the fill level from the measurement signal, and to make the derived fill level available for further processing, evaluation and/or display; comprising the steps of: transmitting send-signals and receiving their echo-signals using the measuring unit; and determining the fill level using the evaluating unit by examining the echo signals for distinctive structures, selecting a parameter set on the basis of the structures, and determining the fill level by means of the selected parameter set as disclosed in view of claims 24, and 28-31 of the reference. While it is not explicitly stated that every possible instruction is stored, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store the parameter sets and instructions necessary for the device to function as intended. The device is disclosed to operate based upon a users input in order to perform specific tests. Therefore, it would be

obvious to have a full set of all possible parameters for the user to select from, instead of only a partial set of parameters.

With respect to claim 12, an arrangement for fill-level measurement using a fill-level measuring device comprising: a measuring unit which serves to produce a measurement signal dependent on the fill level in the container; a memory in which parameter sets for different applications are stored; and an evaluation unit which serves to select a parameter set, and on the basis of the selected parameter set, to derive the fill level from the measurement signal, and to make the derived fill level available for further processing, evaluation and/or display; an apparatus for identifying a present application; and a connection between said apparatus and said evaluating unit exists, via which identifications of said apparatus are available to said evaluating unit as disclosed in paragraph [0057], and in view of claims 24, and 28-31 of the reference. While it is not explicitly stated that every possible instruction is stored, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store the parameter sets and instructions necessary for the device to function as intended. The device is disclosed to operate based upon a users input in order to perform specific tests. Therefore, it would be obvious to have a full set of all possible parameters for the user to select from, instead of only a partial set of parameters.

With respect to claim 13, a method for fill-level measurement using a fill-level measuring device, comprising: a measuring unit which serves to produce a measurement signal dependent on the fill level in the container; a memory in which parameter sets for different applications are stored; and an evaluation unit which serves

to select a parameter set, and on the basis of the selected parameter set, to derive the fill level from the measurement signal, and to make the derived fill level available for further processing, evaluation and/or display; comprising the step of recognizing, on the basis of the measurement signals, events which make a changing of the parameter set necessary as disclosed in paragraph [0008].

With respect to claims 14, the method as claimed in claim 11, wherein the identification of which application is present is output for plausibility review or as input for other devices is disclosed in paragraph [0057].

With respect to claims 15, the method as claimed in claim 13, wherein the identification of which application is present is output for plausibility review or as input for other devices is disclosed in paragraph [0057].

With respect to claims 16 and 17, the definition of commissioning, according to Webster is to order to be made <for example, *commissioned* a portrait>. Therefore, utilizing the same logic as discussed earlier with respect to claim 8, while not explicitly disclosed as such, it would be obvious to have the device shipped out ready to use from the factory. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the device programmed with parameters directly from the manufacturer so that the device can perform at its full potential from its initial use by a user.

Allowable Subject Matter

3.   Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to RODNEY T. FRANK whose telephone number is

(571)272-2193. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hezron E. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-2208. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hezron Williams/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2856

/R. T. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2856
March 17, 2010